

Memorandum

To: Project File

RE: Certification Checklist Verifying Completion of all Environmental Activities Needed to Advertise a Project and Identifying Relevant Environmental Commitments.

(COMPLETED ON ALL PROJECTS REGARDLESS OF FUNDING SOURCE)

Project #: 0609-057-140, P106, R201, M501, B601

UPC #: 18443

Date of Review: 1/31/06

Reviewer: Stephen P. Crowther

ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION/COMMITMENTS CHECKLIST

1. SERP complete?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Exempt

Commitments: The SERP commitments include required water quality permit acquisitions and mitigation, while evidencing efforts to minimize impacts; additional threatened and endangered species reviews; measures to reduce dust and control emissions; and absolutely no encroachment upon the Bethel Beach Natural Area Preserve. The future commitments must be completed by the Design-Build consultant.

2. NEPA document complete?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ No federal action

Commitments: NEPA resource agency coordination was conducted at the Inter-Agency Coordination Meeting on October 12, 2005. The Categorical Exclusion was submitted to FHWA on October 26, 2005. Commitments include required water quality permit acquisitions and mitigation; additional threatened and endangered species reviews during the permit process (with potential time-of-year restrictions); measures to reduce dust and control emissions; and absolutely no encroachment upon the Bethel Beach Natural Area Preserve. The COE has requested specific U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service comment to be included in the water quality permit coordination. The future commitments must be evaluated and completed by the Design-Build consultant.

3. Are water quality permits required?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, provide permit types: The permit types are to be determined by the Design-Build consultant using the IACM process. A reporting NW 23 and 33 are anticipated.

If yes, have water quality permits been obtained?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Commitments: The Design-Build consultant is to determine and obtain the water quality permits.

If yes, was the compensatory mitigation requirement satisfied?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A

Commitments: The Design-Build consultant is to satisfy the compensatory mitigation requirement.

4. Was a quality assurance review made of the ESC plan?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A

Commitments: The Design-Build consultant is to conduct a quality assurance review of the ESC plan. A plan set is to be forwarded to the Fredericksburg District Environmental Manager with adequate time for review and consultant revisions prior to construction. The Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries recommended strict E & S control.

5. Are cultural resources clear for advertisement?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Commitments: Per correspondence signed May 2, 2005, the Virginia Department of Historic Resources concurred that the Garden Creek Irrigation Canal is not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

6. Are hazardous materials clear for advertisement?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Commitments: Proper handling, reuse, and/or disposal of the bridge structure and the creosote timber members are required.

7. Are threatened and endangered species clear for advertisement?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Commitments: See comments under items 1 and 2.

8. Are the final roadway plans for federally funded or regionally significant projects consistent with the TIP/STIP and LRP (MPO areas) or with the STIP (non-MPO areas)?
☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Commitments:


District Environmental Manager

02/22/06
Date

cc: Electronic Signed Scanned Copy To:
State Environmental Administrator
Central Office District Programs Manager
Natural Resources Programs Manager
FHWA (Federal Aid Projects)
Optional Signed Scanned Copy To:
Resident Administrator/Engineer
Assistant District Administrator for Construction
Project Manager (as indicated in PCES)